

Appl. No. 09/598,257
Amdt. dated Dec. 22, 2003
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 22, 2003
Docket No. 6169-155

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The amendments made herein are in response to the advisory action mailed January 15, 2004 sent responsive to the office action mailed September 22, 2003 (Final Office Action). This response is being filed with a request for continued examination and a petition for a one month retroactive extension of time with the appropriate fee.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-10, and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over a Riehle, Dirk [1996] "The Event Notification Pattern: Integrating Implicit Invocation with Object-Orientation" in Theory and Practice of Object Systems, 2, 1, pages 43-52 (Riehle). Claims 3, 6-8, 11, and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Riehle in view of OMG TC Document 95.8.19 [1995] "COM/CORBA Interworking RFP Part A" (OMG) and in further view of "Sun Microsystems, Inc. Remote Method Invocation Specification" (Sun RMI).

In response, the Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 to clarify that the Listener remotely calls a method responsive to an event detected by the Notifier, where the Notifier is located in a first process address space, the listener is located in a second process address space, and the remotely called method is located in a third process address space. The method invoked in the third address space can be invoked even though the Notifier that detects the event may be unaware of the location of the remotely called method. That is, the Notifier need not be aware of the location of the third address space, even though a method in this third address space is invoked responsive to the detected event. Event handling thus occurs in a location transparent fashion.

Applicants have made some assumptions assuming the interpretation of Riehle as expressed in the Office Action. Namely, Applicants interpret the Office Action to draw a correlation between the Subject object (page 8) of Riehle and the client of claim 1 that contains the Notifier and between the Observer object (page 8) of Riehle and the server of claim 1 that contains the Listener. Riehle does not explicitly teach that the Subject and the Observer are disposed in separate processing spaces. The Examiner

{WP165574:1}

Appl. No. 09/596,257
Amdt. dated Dec. 22, 2003
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 22, 2003
Docket No. 6169-155

apparently asserts that the existence of the IAEvLink subclass suggests that the Observer and Subject can be located in separate processing spaces from one another.

The IAEvLink class as shown in Reihle can be a specialization inheritable by the Event Link class. The Event Link class is located in the same processing space as the Subject. That is, the IACAddress of the IACEvLink must be known to the Event Link class. Therefore, the processing space where the event occurs that causes a state change to happen, must be aware of the location of the resulting method.

Stated in a different fashion, on page 8 of Reihle, the Examiner is asserting that the Subject is located in a first address space and that the Observer is located in the second address space (where the second address space is specified by the IACAddress of IACEvLink). Reihle does not teach or suggest a situation where the Observer calls a method that executes in a third address space, which is a limitation of claim 1, claim 4, claim 9, and claim 12.

Applicants further emphasize the relevance of placing the Notifier in a client and the Listener in a server, which is not taught by Reihle. This feature is significant when performing location transparent event handling. When used operationally, the Applicants' method can permit the administrator of a server to change the method that is invoked responsive to the event occurring in the client, without any updates being made to the client software.

For example, a Web server can remotely call Web services, like a call waiting Web service, responsive to detected client events. If an administrator maintaining the Web server decides to utilize a different Web service, such as a cheaper or improved call waiting service, the administrator can alter the remote method that is called whenever the client requests call waiting from the original Web service to the new Web service. This change is transparent to the client. Reihle requires the computer in which the detected event occurs to be aware of the address of method called responsive to the event. Accordingly, no teachings of Reihle would enable the administrator of the example to change call waiting services without changing software residing on the client.

{WP165574:1}


IBM Docket No. BOC9-2000-0012

Appl. No. 09/596,257
Amdt. dated Dec. 22, 2003
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 22, 2003
Docket No. 6169-155

The OMG reference describes the CORBA architecture generally. CORBA is an architecture and specification for creating, distributing, and managing distributed program objects in a network. Sun RMI discloses an architecture through which a programmer using Java can write object-oriented programming in which objects on different computers can interact in a distributed network. The RMI model fails to include event handling procedures. Neither OMG, Sun RMI, nor any combination thereof cure the deficiencies of Reihle.

In light of the above discussion, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-16 is respectfully requested. Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Applicants also request an interview with the Examiner to clarify any misunderstanding that may exist with regards to the present invention and the referenced art. A call to the Examiner to formally schedule this interview will shortly follow the submission of this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 22 Jan 2004

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Kevin T. Cuenot, Registration No. 46,283
Brian K. Buchheit, Registration No. 52,667
AKERMANN SENTERFITT
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

{WP165574:1}